REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11 and 22 are amended. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) do not present any additional claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Richer during the February 12, 2008 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied References

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 1-6, 11-16 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,215,459 to Reddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,812,907 to Gennetten; and (2) rejects claims 7-10, 15 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reddy in view of Gennetten, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,803,884 to Ohzawa. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The applied references fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims because (1) one of ordinary skill would not have combined the references as proposed, as discussed below; and (2) even if the references are combined as proposed, the proposed combination would not disclose all the claimed features.

Reddy discloses a dual display video controller 700 for use in driving two separate displays (Fig. 7). In the embodiments of Figs. 1-6, Reddy discloses that the two displays must have the same screen resolutions (see col. 4, lines 64-67). In the embodiments of Figs.

7-9, Reddy discloses that the two displays can have different resolutions and/or refresh rates (col. 8, lines 4-6). In operation, the dual display video controller 700 stores first and second video frames of data to be displayed on the two displays (e.g., CRT 106 and flat panel 107) as either interleaved pixel data (Abstract) or as separate first and second images (col. 8, lines 6-11).

Gennetten discloses a segmented electronic display 22 for a digital camera 10, the segmented electronic display 22 having segment A 24 and segment B 26 (Figs. 2-3; col. 3, line 40 - col. 4, line 5). Only the small segment A 24 is used when displaying small items. Both segments A 24 and B 26 are used when displaying large items (col. 2, lines 29-33). Gennetten is silent as to the relative sizes of the pixels in segments A 24 and B 26. However, because Gennetten discloses that large images are displayed on both segments A 24 and B 26, that smaller images are displayed only on segment A 24, and that the design goal is to minimize energy use (col. 1, lines 5-8), and is not related to different resolutions, one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that segments A 24 and B 26 have pixels of equal size.

As explained at the personal interview, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the applied references as proposed. Applicant notes that the Office Action cites to *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425 (CCPA 1981) as stating "The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference ... Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art" (emphasis added). As explained at the personal interview, one of ordinary skill in the art, having Reddy and Gennetten in front of him or her, would know of Reddy's embodiments where the two displays have the same resolutions as well as the embodiments where the two displays have different resolutions and would know of Gennetten's segmented display, and, as described above, would understand

that Gennetten's two displays have the same resolution. Faced with the goal of enabling two monitors/displays to be able to display a single image, and knowing the applied references, one of ordinary skill would, at best, use an embodiment of Reddy having two displays that have identical resolutions and modify it to have segmented properties as per Gennetten. The result would be a system having two displays of identical resolutions that can display smaller images on just one display, with the other turned off, and that can display larger images on both displays.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not, faced with the above-identified goal and knowing Reddy and Gennetten, use an embodiment of Reddy that has different display resolutions for the two displays because nowhere in either applied reference is there any motivation or suggestion that the use of different resolution displays is preferable for displaying a single image over two displays. In contrast, the technical knowledge of one of ordinary skill would provide motivation to choose displays having the same display resolution because that is what is used by Gennetten and, further, that would be the easiest to implement from a technological view.

Thus, even if the references are combined as proposed, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest, regarding independent claim 1: (1) "a second display device having a second display area with a second display resolution, wherein the second display resolution is different from the first display resolution"; (2) "an image replicator configured to generate different first and second scale factors necessary to scale the first and second image information data for display on the first and second display devices, respectively, wherein the first and second image information data is scaled by the first and second scale factors for display on the respective first and second display devices"; and (3) "the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the first display area is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the second display area".

Regarding independent claim 11, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest (4) "wherein the display resolution of at least one display area is different from the display resolution of at least one other display area"; (5) "an image replicator configured to generate at least two different scale factors to scale the image information data displayed on corresponding ones of the at least two display devices, wherein the image information data is scaled by the at least two different scale factors for display on corresponding ones of the at least two display devices"; and (6) "the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on one of the at least two display areas is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on at least one other of the at least two display areas".

Regarding independent claim 22, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest (7) "the second display area having a second display resolution, wherein the second display resolution is different from the first display resolution"; (8) "an image replicator configured to generate different scale factors to scale the first and second portions of an image displayed on corresponding ones of the first and second display devices, wherein the first and second portions of an image are scaled by the scale factors for display on the corresponding ones of the first and second display devices"; and (9) "the displayed resolution of the first portion of the image is different than the displayed resolution of the second portion of the image."

The applied references fail to disclose or suggest features (1), (3)-(4), (6)-(7), and (9) above because, as discussed above, if one of ordinary skill did combine Reddy and Gennetten as proposed, the proposed combination would utilize two displays having identical resolutions, as disclosed or suggested by both Reddy and Gennetten.

The applied references fail to disclose or suggest features (2), (5), and (8) above because, as neither Reddy nor Gennetten discloses the scaling of images to produce a

continuous image across two displays, neither reference discloses the claimed image replicator or different scale factors.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/jhb

Date: February 20, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037